

**WASHINGTON STATE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD
FOR KING COUNTY**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

October 14, 2004

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Denton convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Lloyd Baker

A. J. Culver

Claudia Hirschey

Roger Loschen

Michael Marchand

Judy Tessandore

III MINUTES

Regular Meeting: Chair Denton presented the minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 27, 2004 for review and action by the Board members.

Action: A.J. Culver moved and Lloyd Baker seconded the motion to adopt the minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 27, 2004. The Board voted unanimously to approve this record.

IV ADMINISTRATION

A. CHAIR'S REPORT

General Business

Chair Denton reported that the Board has been working on several projects, including: (1) coordinating programs with King County Executive/Council 2004 Work Program; (2) coordinating efforts with the State Association to develop and implement a program for work with the CTED Annexation Study, the State Legislature Interim Session, and Legislature 2005; (3) Year 2005 Budget Proposal; (4) pre-development review for future Notices of Intention; and (5) providing procedural information to a community group investigating options for incorporation. The Board has also been addressing the tasks of annual personnel reviews, selection of members for the 2005-2009 term of office, and nomination of officers for 2005. Committee members and staff will report on each of these activities.

State Boundary Review Board Association Conference: Mrs. Blauman reported that the State Boundary Review Board Association Conference materials have been distributed to all Board members.

Chair Denton invited comment on the Association Fall Conference. Board members offered the following comments:

- The Conference was attended by 49 Board members and numerous staff members representing several counties. The attendance level – and the larger number of counties represented at the Conference – provided for a quality experience.
- Speakers at the Conference provided excellent information concerning matters of interest to boundary review boards, including the basic role and responsibilities of boundary review boards, the role of the Growth Management Act, planning law, current issues, water rights, the role of special purpose districts (i.e., schools, fire districts and water districts). A mock hearing raised several interesting questions relating to the public review process.
- Of particular interest was a panel presentation on special purpose districts (Michael Hanis, Brian Snure, Carter Bagg). This session provided excellent information on the role and the function of special purposes districts, the benefits and costs of special purpose districts, and the relationship of special purpose districts to cities. The speakers also addressed the challenges that the Growth Management Act creates for special purpose districts as these agencies endeavor to provide essential, economic public services to citizens.

- A session presented by Special Assistant Attorney General Robert Kaufman was also a highlight of the conference. Mr. Kaufman provided substantive and timely materials concerning basic law and the context in which the law is applied (with specific cases as examples).
- The Conference also included a useful presentation on issues anticipated to be before the Legislature in 2005. The session was presented by Marcia Fromhold, a legislative consultant selected to serve the Association in 2005.

City of Redmond NE Rose Hills Annexation (File No. 2168) – Update: The Board's Resolution and Hearing Decision was issued on September 28, 2004. The appeal period will conclude on October 28, 2004. There have been requests for copies of file material. There have been no requests for transcripts. To date, there is no information as to whether or not any party with standing will file an appeal to Superior Court.

B. Committee Reports

Budget Committee:

A.J. Culver and Lenora Blauman reported on the status of the King County Budget review and the specific status of the Boundary Review Board budget proposal.

King County Executive Budget Proposal: King County Executive Ron Sims transmitted to the County Council his 2005 Executive Proposed Budget on October 11, 2004. In sum, Mr. Sims reported that the \$3.3 billion budget proposed for 2005 is balanced and sturdy with no drastic reductions, no consolidations and no large scale cuts to programs, services or staff.

This budget reflects the hard work County officials and staff have accomplished over the last several years in stabilizing King County government. The result of that collaboration is a much stronger government that can "provide public health, safety, human services, transportation and environmental services to 1.8 million people in the county while keeping well within its means."

However, the county still faces financial shortages due to the 150-year old archaic funding structure under which counties in Washington struggle. There are several key County initiatives this year that will further refine our efficiencies and how the County does business. The County has stabilized the government for the next three years, but this government must do more to ensure ongoing success.

Mr. Sims reported that a key goal is the implementation of the King County Annexation Initiative. In brief, the Annexation Initiative was launched in 2004 to promote accelerated annexation of the remaining unincorporated areas in King County. A funding base of approximately \$10 million (plus \$13 million from regional improvement funds) was made available to assist cities in providing for governance and services to annexing areas. Notable progress has been made based upon new interest by cities in considering annexation (or incorporation) of urban areas. In addition, King County has been working in Olympia to "raise the visibility" of the issues related to annexation. At the request of King County, the State is conducting a study to "increase understanding of obstacles to accelerated annexation and incorporations." The study will be completed in November of 2004 and will "serve as a basis for future state-level dialogue" concerning strategies to enable annexations and incorporations.

The Executive is proposing that the funding levels approved in the 2004 Adopted Budget for the Annexation Initiative be maintained in the 2005 Budget. The second year Annexation Initiative will "build on 2004 progress in working with cities and unincorporated communities to identify the best alternatives for cost-based governance. In 2005 several key annexation and incorporation studies will be completed which should result in near-term decisions to annex or incorporate. Wherever cities are willing to work with the County for such a purpose, interlocal agreement negotiations will commence whereby the county and city would share service costs. The County must be able to offer competitive contract services to cities following annexation or incorporation.

Further, in 2005, a key work effort will be the further refinement of direct service and overhead costs attributable to each of the major urban unincorporated areas and to estimate the savings

possible following annexation or incorporation. The County has begun the process of assessing revenues and costs for governance/services in each of the County's major unincorporated areas (10 areas totaling approximately 51 square miles).

(Note: A copy of the Annexation Initiative has been provided to each Board member.)

The King County Council has begun to review the Executive Proposed Budget. Hearings involving the Leadership and Strategic Investments Budget (which encompasses all general government funding, including the funds for the Boundary Review Board) will take place at several meetings through October and November. A key objective of those meetings is the development of "creative solutions (to) resolve complex problems by looking at budget requests both systematically and comprehensively." Councilmembers David Irons and Larry Gossett will be chairing the Leadership and Strategic Investments Budget Panel.

The Council intends to complete the comprehensive budgetary review and to approve the 2005 County Budget on November 22, 2004.

More information about the 2005 King County Executive Proposed Budget is available online, at www.metrokc.gov/exec <<http://www.metrokc.gov/exec>>.

Boundary Review Board Budget Proposal: A. J. Culver and Lenora Blauman reported that the Board's Year 2005 Budget, proposed at \$256,827 (increased from \$232,500 to adjust for increased central fund expenditures) remains listed on the Council's Consent Agenda. Items on the Consent Agenda are designated as necessary and non-controversial expenditures.

The Board's budget proposal is considered to be appropriate based upon Council funding criteria, as this budget proposal is based upon historic budgets and forecast workload. The Budget Committee and staff have evaluated each budget item to ensure that all expenditures are necessary. As the Board functions under state law, and with a lean budget, there are extremely limited avenues for cost reduction.

If the Board's Budget Proposal remains on the Consent Agenda, then funding for 2005 should be allocated as a matter of routine when the CX budget is adopted in November of 2004.

However, Mrs. Blauman has been advised that the Council Legislative Analyst assigned to the Board is considering a proposal to remove the Board's budget for more detailed review and evaluation, with a recommendation to eliminate the Board and to transfer the Board's responsibilities to the County Council. Mrs. Blauman will be addressing this matter with the Legislative Analyst. A. J. Culver, as Budget Committee Chair, will provide his services as well.

Mrs. Blauman reported that, in each of the past four years the Board's Budget Proposal has been initially assigned to the Consent Agenda and then removed from that Agenda at the Council's request for additional data concerning the structure and function of the Board. At the conclusion of deliberation, the Council has historically adopted an intact budget for the Board.

Nominating Committee: Roger Loschen, Chair of the Nominating Committee, reported that the Committee will be meeting on or before November 18, 2004 to select candidates for Chair-Elect for 2005. Judy Tessandore, who is Chair-Elect this year, will serve as Chair in 2005.

Personnel Committee:

Personnel Performance Review: A. J. Culver, Personnel Committee Member, reported that the Personnel Committee met on October 14, 2004 to conduct a performance review for Lenora Blauman.

Mr. Denton called for an Executive Session for the Board to consider the Performance Review for Mrs. Blauman.

Action: A. J. Culver moved and Judy Tessandore seconded the motion for the Board to enter into an Executive Session (10 minutes) for the purpose of considering the Performance Review for Mrs. Blauman. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. The Board entered into Executive Session at 8:00 p.m.

Action: Judy Tessandore moved and Michael Marchand seconded the motion for the Board to return to the Regular Meeting at 8:10 p.m. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

The Personnel Committee presented the performance review report for Mrs. Blauman for a decision by the full Board. The Board members expressed appreciation to Mrs. Blauman for her service to the agency. Mrs. Blauman thanked the Board for the opportunity to work with Board members, with staff, and with King County officials and stakeholders.

Action: Judy Tessandore moved and Michael Marchand seconded a motion to accept the Performance Review Report for Mrs. Blauman and to recommend a merit salary increase commensurate with her service to the Board and consistent with the salary standards set by King County.

Boundary Review Board Membership: Mr. Culver reported that the Personnel Committee has also begun to work with Mrs. Blauman for the purpose of securing appointments to the Board for 2005-2009. To date:

- The Association of Fire Commissioners is working to provide a slate of candidates from which the Board will select one representative to the Fire District. That person will replace Ethel Hanis. Candidates' names will be provided to the Board in the coming weeks.
- The Cities of King County have received the application by A. J. Culver to continue service to the Board. An initial progress report is anticipated by October 18, 2004.
- The King County Executive is seeking two persons to join the Board to replace Ellen Abellera and Lloyd Baker. An initial progress report is anticipated by October 18, 2004.
- The Office of the Governor has reported that appointments to the Board must be made by the new governor. Governor Locke will forward the names and applications of Michael Marchand and Van Anderson to continue service to the Board. Under state law, Mr. Marchand and Ms. Anderson may continue to serve until new appointments are finalized by the Governor.

Personnel Committee members and Mrs. Blauman will be working with the Office of the Governor, the Office of the King County Executive, the Cities of King County, and the Special Purpose Districts to secure new appointments and reappointments by January 2005 or the earliest feasible date thereafter.

C. Executive Secretary's Report

CTED Annexation Issues Study: Mrs. Blauman provided a summary of the CTED Annexation Study Team activities.

On October 14, the CTED Advisory Committee had a third meeting in a series of meetings to consider annexation impediments/strategies relating to:

- RCW 35.13A (Cities and Towns) and other annexation-related legislation
- RCW 36.70A (Growth Management Act)
- RCW 36.93 (Boundary Review Board Enabling Act)

The CTED Advisory Committee's preliminary agenda for that discussion lists the following issues:

- Discussion of gaps in study data defined pursuant to annexation impediments and strategies.
- Presentation of preliminary results from surveys and focus groups
- Local Tax Authority and Capital Facilities Funding Issues and Strategies

In the budget proviso directing CTED to conduct a study to the barriers to annexation, CTED is directed to:

- Propose possible changes to city and county taxing authority which will serve to aid the transfer of annexation of remaining urban growth areas in a timely manner;

- Identify and discuss the need for funding of capital improvement projects needed to provide urban levels of service.

The following issue discussions spell out some possible solutions to fiscal obstacles to annexation. In each case the solution must be feasible from a legal, financial, and political perspective. There are at least four different political perspectives to be discussed: state, county, municipal, and public.

- State Policies and Revenue Sources

State Funding. In most areas, the cost for the city to serve an area will exceed the tax generated revenue to that area. This is an important obstacle to annexation. Responses to CTED survey show that cities and counties generally agree that a state fund to support the upgrade of infrastructure for these areas would remove an important hurdle to annexation.

- What source(s) of revenue could be created, or diverted, to pay for a state fund?
- Would it be feasible to give some sort of preference or extra points for state infrastructure loans or grants if an interlocal agreement for the annexation area is in effect?

Timing of revenue receipt. Annexing cities do not receive tax revenues as soon as the annexation process is complete. Depending on the date an area is annexed, cities must wait a few months or many months. To minimize the lag period, cities must pay attention to the dates established by the Department of Revenue. The problem has not been identified as a major obstacle to annexation, but the responding cities and counties generally agree that reducing the lag time between annexation and receipt of tax revenues would improve the current situation.

- How could state statutes be revised to reduce the lag time between annexation and receipt of property and sales tax revenues?

- Local Tax Sources

Utility Tax Surcharge. A utility tax surcharge could be used to pay for infrastructure costs in areas with little tax revenue. The surcharge could be collected during a pre-determined transition period before and after annexation (or incorporation).

- What hurdles would have to be overcome to authorize such a surcharge?
- Are there other potential sources of funding for infrastructure?

Property Taxes. The current cap on property tax increases is causing local governments to rely more on sales tax. The existing policies can cause tension between counties and cities who both need the revenues from retail areas.

- Do we want to consider a proposal to raise the current cap on property taxes?
- Are there other potential sources of taxation that would ease the competition for sales-tax-generating land?

County Funding. The cities responding to the survey agreed that they would like to require counties to pay annexing cities/towns some portion of the costs to provide services to areas with little tax revenue. The payments would span an established transition period before and after annexation (or incorporation). The counties that have responded to the survey disagree with the cities. Kitsap County's "revenue sharing" approach may be one useful model.

- Would such a transfer of funds from the counties to the cities be feasible?

- Shift sales tax distribution. Counties resist allowing annexation of areas that generate substantive sales tax revenue. A solution to this obstacle would be to shift the distribution of sales tax revenue so that jurisdictions with little retail receive some of that revenue. The previous source of sales tax equalization was the motor vehicle excise tax, which was repealed by I-695.

- Is a redistribution of sales tax revenue feasible?
- How would this tie to Washington's attempts to address the sales tax sourcing issue in order to participate in national initiatives regarding internet sales?

- Local sales/use tax diversion. The 32 rural counties are authorized to impose a local sales/use tax of up to 0.08 percent (credit against the state 6.5 percent tax). All of the 32 counties are currently levying the tax. The current tax may only be used for financing of public facilities for economic development purposes. The list of eligible counties could be expanded to include the remaining seven urban counties. An expansion of the use of this tax to the more urban counties could be used to finance infrastructure in unincorporated urban growth areas.
 - Would a further diversion of the state sales/use tax for infrastructure financing in unincorporated urban growth areas facilitate annexation?
 - Is an expansion of the 0.08 local sales/use tax to urban counties feasible?
- Tax Increment Financing. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) could be used as a tool to facilitate annexation. To implement a traditional TIF, the state constitution would need to be amended.
 - Would TIF be a useful tool in Washington to facilitate annexations?
 - Is a constitutional amendment worth consideration?

The CTED Team made a decision to focus on the following solutions for gaps in funding options:

- State Policies and Revenues
- Shift sales tax distribution
- Local sales/use tax diversion

The CTED Team also began discussion of the updated Identification of Annexation Barriers and Strategies (initiated in September 2004). Discussion included the following matters:

| Gaps in capital facility funding | |
|---|---|
| Barriers | Strategies |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ County financing insufficient to support city standards in unincorporated UGAs. ▪ County standards not always deficient, just different from city standards. ▪ County investment is lost with annexation. There is no reimbursement from the annexing city, so the county is reluctant to make the investment. ▪ State funding is inadequate for maintaining LOS for incorporations. ▪ Lack of financing or financing mechanism to help the transition from county to city. ▪ \$3.5 million deficit in operating service costs for a residential annexation area (Kirkland) ▪ Can't spend impact fees on planning for capital facilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The county should plan to the city's standards within the UGA. Will need to deal with counties that would have to administer a variety of codes (39 in King County), the liability of applying someone else's standards, and union issues. ▪ Use the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act to allow processing of permits outside the city by the city. ▪ Need a process that can make everyone whole financially. ▪ Need a transition funding mechanism. ▪ If an interlocal agreement is in effect, get preference points for state infrastructure funding. ▪ State should provide matching funds for investment in facilities needed for transition. |

| Role and authority of boundary review boards | |
|---|--|
| Barriers | Strategies |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The BRB criteria don't match GMA requirements. ▪ Role of the BRBs not clear post-GMA. ▪ It is not clear how the BRB should treat the statutory "urban in character" objective given the fact that no area can be considered that has not been designated part of the UGA by the county ▪ County legislative authorities do not want to take over BRB duties. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify the statute regarding the objectives, including the "urban in character" objective. ▪ Eliminate the "urban in character" objective because it is no longer needed. ▪ Make the GMA and annexation statutes more consistent – e.g. application of the GMA goals ▪ Eliminate the BRBs. ▪ All UGAs should automatically become cities. ▪ Retain the BRBs for public process on annexations. ▪ Prohibit provision of urban services (or development, regardless of service level) until annexed (Oregon model) ▪ BRBs are needed as a safety mechanism for the process. ▪ Need to associate UGAs with cities (potential annexation areas). ▪ Shouldn't associate UGAs with cities because they may be too big to annex and need to be incorporated separately. ▪ BRB could be objective party to educate public. |

| GMA and annexation processes | |
|---|--|
| Barriers | Strategies |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City development standards different than special districts Lack of public understanding of process. Statutes are cumbersome, GMA and annexation statutes don't match. There is no linkage between the two statutes Cities cannot do an active public relations campaign for annexation. The process is expensive and out of proportion for small annexations. Counties have a difficult time working with the development standards of multiple cities within the UGA. Problem is made worse by development in unincorporated UGAs by counties at a lower LOS, widening the discrepancy from city LOS. Counties and cities are not doing joint planning to ensure the same LOS in UGAs. Special districts often oppose annexations. The size of some UGAs/annexation areas in relation to an existing city can be overwhelming. County-wide planning policies are difficult to revise. Predictability problems discourage investment. Counties cannot initiate annexations. "Islands" are still an issue. The recent legislation helped, but more needs to be done as demographics and the provision for a referendum are still problems. Interlocal agreements are not being used fully. Cities can't get revenues from property taxes for two years after annexation occurs. A county's development review costs are lost if annexation occurs before a permit is issued. The double petition method of annexation is not being used (only aware of one instance) as it is hard for cities to get the support of landowners <u>and</u> registered voters Need a way to deal with an area that won't incorporate and a city cannot take on. Annexation and incorporation does not reduce the level of permit activity in the UGA. Petition verification required by the county auditor is onerous for a city Contractual problems with transfer of services under interlocal agreements. Liability issues under an interlocal agreement when permitting is delegated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit standing to challenge annexations. Give the counties authority to initiate an annexation. Limit referenda (perhaps only in urban counties?). On "islands" bill, raise the 10% threshold to a small majority, e.g., 51%, 60%. Re-structure the public involvement process. Require involvement of citizens and special districts earlier in the process "UGA" equals "Annexation Area" Require intergovernmental agreements Require CWPPs to identify "potential annexation or incorporation areas" in the six counties Authorize a utility tax surcharge for the transition period – requiring voter approval like assumption of indebtedness Add new tools so a variety of approaches are available to match the variety of situations. In doing this, keep responsibility and authority together Create separate methods for large and small annexations Require involvement of citizens and special districts earlier in the process Don't put land in the UGA unless a city is willing to annex it Put a moratorium (urban holding overlay) on expanding the UGA unless it will be annexed with urban services. SHB 1801 - authorize annexation based on commitment to provide water and sewer. Limit standing to challenge annexations, except BRB decisions, to superior court. Need a statutory mechanism for an area that won't incorporate and a city will not annex. AWC and WSAC bill with benefits of skipping the annexation/BRB process if an interlocal is entered into between the city and county Change the requirement for the petition method of annexation from 75% of assessed value for non-code cities and towns to match the 60% requirement for code cities. Make the petition method requirement for both code and non-code cities and towns to be 51% of assessed value (simple majority). Revise 1755 to require cities to do extraterritorial planning for urban islands that the county must match in its planning regarding zoning and density. Make it easier to annex under 1755 by eliminating the referendum requirement. Eliminate all unincorporated islands on a date certain. Provide incentives for entering into a interlocal agreement, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sign an interlocal with a public process, can annex without a referendum Don't identify what should go in an interlocal agreement, leave that up to what the county and city need Funding Amend the Interlocal Cooperation Act to address contractual and liability problems |

This is a work in progress to be developed as the CTED Team gathers data and receives input from the Advisory Committee.

The CTED Study Team will meet in November to complete preparation of the final report to the Legislature. The Report will be presented to the Legislature in December 2004. Report findings will form the framework for new legislation proposed to Legislature 2005 to remove obstacles to and encourage annexations of urban areas. It will be important to remain mindful of the differences between these counties and the counties not included in the study. Recommendations should be limited to these counties, with consideration of how they might apply statewide as a separate step.

Fairwood Incorporation: Mrs. Blauman reported that the Fairwood Incorporation Team is continuing to consult with County officials, representatives from Renton and Kent, and BRB staff to establish:

- incorporation boundaries,
- a scope of work,
- plan for securing support from citizens,
- plan for securing support from the Boundary Review Board, and
- timeline for consideration of the proposed action.

The Team is considering a plan to conduct a comprehensive basic Incorporation Study, beginning in November, 2004. The Team would use that study as the basis for its Notice of Intention. The Team hopes to begin the official application process in December 2004. The Team envisions submitting a Notice of Intention to the Boundary Review Board in early 2005. The Team is hopeful that the Incorporation Study will be sufficiently complete and timely to permit the action to proceed through the various legal, technical, and public review processes without the need for an additional economic and fiscal study. The Team is interested in taking the proposed incorporation to election in November 2005.

The Team has been notified that this proposed schedule is extremely ambitious. The Team has been advised that the Board will certainly work to provide review of the incorporation application in a timely manner. However, the Team has also been advised that the Board is required to undertake specific processes in order to achieve compliance with state law. That process will likely require an independent incorporation study to determine the viability of an incorporation. As such, the Team must be prepared to proceed under an alternative plan which would provide for an incorporation election in 2006.

2004/2005 Meeting Schedule

Mrs. Blauman presented a tentative schedule of Regular Meetings and Special Meetings for November, 2004, December 2004, January 2005 and February 2005. A final schedule will be distributed in the near future.

D. CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence was reviewed briefly. No questions or issues were raised with respect to the substance of the correspondence.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. NOTICES OF INTENTION

No new Notices of Intention have been submitted to the Board.

B. PENDING FILES

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| Auburn | Covington |
| Kent | Ronald Sewer District |
| Woodinville | Kirkland |
| Federal Way | Renton (4 files) |
| Tukwila | Redmond |

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Action: Judy Tessandore moved and Michael Marchand seconded a motion to adjourn the Boundary Review Board Regular Meeting. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

NEXT MONTH: APA CONFERENCE 2005

| DATE | EVENT/TIME | LOCATION |
|--|---|--|
| November 3 | City of Renton – Merritt II ▪ Tour at 4:00 p.m. ▪ Supper at 5:30 p.m. ▪ Hearing at 7:00 p.m. | ▪ Sierra Heights Elementary School ▪ Armando's Restaurant ▪ Sierra Heights Elementary School |
| November 18 | ▪ Nominating Committee – 4:00 p.m. ▪ Supper – 5:30 p.m. ▪ Regular Meeting – 7:00 p.m. | ▪ _____ ▪ _____ ▪ Bellevue Fire District |
| December 9 | ▪ Regular Meeting - 5:30 p.m. ▪ Supper Event - 7:00 p.m. | ▪ Doubletree Inn/Maxie's ▪ Doubletree Inn/Maxie's |
| December 13 & December 14 (Tentative) | City of Renton – Merritt II ▪ Supper at 5:30 p.m. ▪ Hearing at 7:00 p.m. | ▪ _____ Restaurant ▪ Sierra Heights Elementary School |
| January 14, 2005 | ▪ Supper at 5:30 p.m. ▪ Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. (Merritt II Decision) | ▪ _____ Restaurant ▪ Bellevue Fire District |
| February 10, 2005 | ▪ Supper at 5:30 p.m. ▪ Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. (New Member Orientation) | ▪ _____ Restaurant ▪ Bellevue Fire District |

Special Meeting Minutes & Resolution & Hearing Decision Report Format/Content:

Technical Issues:

- Both the Special Meeting Minutes and the Resolution & Hearing Decision for the proposed NE Rose Hill Annexation are extremely detailed in their reporting of testimony and deliberation. Some Board members believe that the statutory requirements – and the interests of the community – would be effectively served by providing more brief reports focused on a summary of actions and conclusions by the Board.

Based upon the fact that the existing documents have been prepared in a manner consistent with materials prepared for previous special meetings, and the fact that the due date for the completion of the present Resolution and Hearing Decision is October 2, 2004, it is recommended that the present documents be brought forward for consideration by the Board.

Mrs. Blauman will confer with Special Assistant Attorney General Robert Kaufman to consider options for the development of a more concise reporting system that would be appropriate and effective to meet the interests of the Board, the community, and other regulatory authorities.

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 27, 2004
To: James Denton, Chair
Boundary Review Board Members
From: Lenora Blauman, Executive Secretary
Subjects: Washington State Chapter of the American Planning Association Legislative Positions (2005)
CTED Study of Annexation Issues

Enclosed for your information are two documents:

- A Statement of the Washington State Chapter of the American Planning Association Legislative Positions (2005).

The APA Legislative Platform covers several areas that are of direct and indirect interest to the Boundary Review Board. At this time, the APA is planning to follow the CTED Study of Annexations. When the CTED Study is completed and legislation is proposed, then APA may establish positions with respect to that legislation.

- CTED Study of Annexation Issues

This attachment includes the following materials from the CTED Advisory Committee on the Study of Annexation Issues: (1) Matrix of Preliminary Identification of Annexation Barriers and Strategies; and (2) CTED Survey of Obstacles and Strategies to Annexation.

The Matrix of Preliminary Identification of Annexation Barriers and Strategies (Update) was initially developed by the CTED Advisory Committee in July, 2004. The Survey was developed by the CTED Advisory Committee. The Committee utilized the Matrix as the basis for this questionnaire which is designed to identify both barriers and strategies to achieving full annexation or incorporation of these urban areas. The Survey was distributed to elected officials and planning directors in the six buildable lands counties (King, Kitsap, Clark, Pierce, Snohomish, and Thurston). Each jurisdiction will decide who shall complete the Survey. Data from this survey and other research will be included in CTED's report to the Legislature in December 2004.

Special purpose district association members and boundary review boards were provided with copies of this Survey. The CTED Advisory Committee has invited boundary review board comments. These **comments are due** to Susan Winchell (swinchell@spokanecounty.org) or to Lenora Blauman **by noon on September 28, 2004.**

If you have questions or would like more information, please contact Lenora Blauman at 206-296-6800.

Thank you for your consideration.